

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

ALEX ADAMS, #1181239,

Plaintiff,

v.

ASHLEE CANTWELL,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:20-cv-11-JDK-KNM

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Alex Adams, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

Before the Court are Plaintiff's motion for a protective order (Docket No. 42), construed as a motion for a preliminary injunction, and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 44). On January 10, 2022, Judge Mitchell issued a Report recommending that the Court deny both motions (Docket No. 62). A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff at his last-known address. However, no objections have been received.


This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court

examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 62) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for a protective order (Docket No. 42), construed as a motion for a preliminary injunction, and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 44) are **DENIED**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 12th day of **February, 2022**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE